Mayor and Council Workshop
6 p.m. March 14, 2023
Holly Springs Law Enforcement Center and livestream

MINUTES

The Holly Springs Town Council held a workshop meeting on Tuesday, March 14, 2023 at the Law Enforcement Center and via livestream. Mayor Mayefskie presided, calling the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was established as the Mayor and five Council members were present as the meeting opened.

Council Members Present in the room: Mayor Sean Mayefskie, Mayor Pro Tem Dan Berry, and Council members Aaron Wolff, Shaun McGrath, Tim Forrest, and Danielle Hewetson.
Council Members absent: none.

Staff Members Present in the room: Randy Harrington, Town Manager; Linda McKinney, Town Clerk (recording the minutes); Daniel Weeks, Assistant Town Manager; Scott Chase, Assistant Town Manager; Corey Petersohn, Budget, Innovation and Sustainability; Mathew Mutter, IT; John Schifano, Town Attorney; Cassie Hack, Director of Communications and Marketing; Chris Hills, Director, Development Services; Greg Sponseller, Sustainability Coordinator; Tina Stroupe, Finance Director.

1. Overview: Randy Harrington, Town Manager, gave an overview of the meeting agenda.

2. FY24 Budget

a. Utility Rates Finalization

Tina Stroupe, Finance Director, said this item was to present updated information on the Rate Model in preparation for the budget conversation. She said that since the Retreat, the Sanford Water bid has moved from April 2023 to August 2023 due to delays from the permitting agencies. She said the Fuquay-Varina Conveyance bid is scheduled for March 2024 and the Utley Creek Water Reclamation Facility Expansion bid anticipated for March of 2025. On the Sanford Water Treatment Project, Holly Springs' costs have proportionately increased approximately $5 million at the 90% design stage. She said that additional soft costs (administration, debt issuance, legal, etc.) are anticipated, but are not yet known, and were not included in the estimate. She shared updated debt issuance and rate increase projections, that have narrowed since the retreat. Debt issuance would be $35.8 million in FY 2023, zero in FY 2024, $35.8 million in FY 2025, and $106.3 million in FY 2026. Rate increases are estimated to be 15-16% in fiscal years 2024, 2025, and 2026, and 6-7% in fiscal years 2027 and 2028. MPT Berry asked if these increases were proposed for the upcoming budget. Ms. Stroupe said staff were asking for Council's guidance on preparing the budget.

Ms. Stroupe outlined some potential factors to consider that could impact the rates. Positive impacts would be a strong financial performance by the Town enabling us to put more money into the project that would reduce the debt requirement; the efforts of the grant writer to procure grants for the Town; and adjustments to the sale of debt which might require less to be financed. Negative impacts could be additional increases in the project or bid costs, and a rescheduled bid date or the delay of the project. She said that next steps would be for Council to provide guidance to the Manager on a rate recommendation plan to execute the Utility Community Investment Plan and other operating needs. Then the Town Manager will include these as part of the recommended budget presentation on May 9th.

MPT Berry asked if all the existing grants were factored into the cost and Ms. Stroupe said they were.

b. Strategic Plan Update

Corey Petersohn, Office of Budget, Innovation, and Strategy, said that this was a review of potential updates to the Mayor and Council's Strategic Plan. He reminded Council of the completed initiatives that were outlined at the Retreat. He said four potential new initiatives that Council saw at the retreat were:

1. Reduce Town facility energy consumption by 10% over the next 5 years (Responsible and Balanced Growth)
2. Transition all Town light duty non-public safety vehicles to hybrid or electric with a goal for full implementation by 2030 (Responsible and Balanced Growth)
3. Implementation of a new yard waste cart model and resident convenience centers (Responsible and Balanced Growth) and
4. Assess fire station coverage needs and potential locations for future Fire Stations 4 and 5 (Safe and Friendly).

MPT Berry asked if the sustainability plan was a staff-level document. Mr. Petersohn said it was and was shared in the packet at the retreat. He said that the return on investment (ROI) on these would result in a cost-savings for the Town. He said the software would ensure that the Town was getting what contractors tell them they are getting in terms of energy savings. MPT Berry said the fourth initiative was something we do not talk about enough. It needs to be done. He said that he takes issue with the electric vehicle initiative. He doesn't want to be tied to being all electric by 2030. He wants to leave it to departments to go electric if it makes sense to the department. Mr. Petersohn said the initiative does include hybrid as well as electric, acknowledging that we don't know how supply chains will be. Mayor Mayefskie asked where 2030 came from as a goal year. Randy Harrington, Town Manager, said that was a common target year among other organizations and businesses. Mr. Petersohn said it was a bit of a stretch, but not unobtainable. Council member Wolff asked what the potential ROI would be on hitting the 2030 goal as opposed to not setting a date. Mr. Petersohn said that the Town's fleet replacement cycle is a 5-7-year cycle. So this timeline allows for a bit more than one full replacement cycle. He said the initiative is referring to sedans, and small vehicles that would see savings in fuel costs. The Town spends close to $3 million on fuel now. Council member Hewetson asked if it would make sense to not put a year, but to say when a vehicle reaches the end of its cycle to consider replacing it with electric. Council member McGrath said he doesn't like "all" statements. He asked how many vehicles we were talking about. Mr. Harrington said that about half of the fleet is light duty. Greg Sponseller, Sustainability Coordinator, said the Town has about 200 units of rolling stock, and only about half are in this consideration. The 5-8-year time range corresponds with the replacement cycle, which gives us time to evaluate each vehicle as it comes up for replacement. If in 2030 we have a newish vehicle it wouldn't be replaced just because it wasn't electric. It is a goal to work towards.

Council member Wolff asked if the Fleet Manager thinks this is a manageable goal. Mr. Petersohn said they have been working with the Fleet Manager and Public Works in drafting this goal. Staff can't control the supply side. The year is because most sustainability goals are 2030 or 2050. Staff chose 2030 because they have been pushing for goals to be measurable, not open ended. Having a goal gives you a measurable metric. But this is Council's Strategic Plan and they can decide. Mr. Harrington said that the other thing staff are trying to accomplish with this goal is, there is a level of infrastructure that has to go along with this conversion. The Town doesn't want to get to a place where the industry has changed and we haven't changed with it. If we hold off it will be more of a push to get the infrastructure in place without extra expense. MPT Berry said that oil is not going away. Saudi Arabia made record profits this year. We have put all our development inspectors in Ford F-150s and now we're going to put them in Nissan

Leafs? He said he struggles with the economics of going all electric. We need to reword this initiative to say we are going to make strides, whether in our own infrastructure, with chargers or support, or supplies, but not go all in. He said he doesn't think the country will be drastically different by 2030. Council member Forrest said he thinks a lot of governments are pulling back on going electric because the infrastructure is not there. He thinks 2030 is too aggressive. We should go electric, but not by 2030. We have a lot of other bills we need to pay. He said he would be OK with 2040 or 2050, but not willing to pay extra for hybrid or electric vehicles. He thinks we can afford to wait.

Mayor Mayefskie said Council was in agreement with 3 of the 4 initiatives. If we modify the verbiage on Initiative 2 to "as we rotate our vehicles out" would there be consensus? Council member Wolff said he doesn't see the difficulty in leaving it in. Just because it says 2030, nothing will happen if we don't meet that goal. He said he trusts the staff to implement the Strategic Plan in a way that is fiscally responsible. But if the problem is the date, just cut that date out. Our staff will make the same decisions. Council member Forrest said he agreed with taking the date out, but he would like a more teased-out plan. Council member Wolff said that it's not like we're going to get to December 2029 and replace all the existing vehicles. Council member McGrath said the problem with a multi-layered organization is that someone reads this document, the key words they will hit on are "all" and "2030." So he thinks an annual assessment of all light duty vehicles, to transition to electric or hybrid as makes sense, but not a goal. Council member Hewetson said it makes sense to her to go on a more case-by-case basis. Taking a look at it in that time and place, whether it's yearly or as vehicles come to the end of their useful life. Mr. Harrington said he was hearing that Council would like to remove the word "all" and strike "with a goal for full implementation by 2030." Council member McGrath said he wanted to add the words "as appropriate." Mr. Harrington said that there is an ROI question, and staff takes that into consideration. Staff is not going to purchase luxury vehicles, but wants to prepare for the future. There was consensus for this language.

Mr. Petersohn said that at the Retreat, in conversation with Lee Worsley, Council identified four potential actions to take towards Responsible & Balanced Growth, Goal 5 – Promote a Diverse Supply of Housing Options. These were

- Preserve and Expand Ownership: Review Future Land Use Map;
- Meet Demand: Determine Development Incentive Options;
- Promote Partnerships: Incentivizing using Utility Allocation policy; and
- Retain Existing Residents: Focus on Housing Hub Website.

He suggested the following initiatives to measure those actions.

Initiative 5.1: Evaluate and identify potential modifications to Vision Holly Springs Comprehensive Plan Section 1: Land Use & Character to support greater housing diversity, specifically along transportation corridors and in proximity to employment centers.

Initiative 5.2: Develop preferred options for inclusion in developer agreements and partnerships with non-profit and private organizations to create more affordable housing options.

Initiative 5.3: Leverage the Utility Allocation Ordinance to increase consideration of affordable housing options in future development. And

Initiative 5.4: Update the Housing hub website as a resource for developers and residents seeking information on housing programs and data on housing in Holly Springs.

Council member McGrath asked about how the current pipeline of apartments and housing changes the gap. Because there is a huge magnitude of difference in what was presented at the retreat and the updated numbers, and he doesn't think we have as much of a problem. Chris Hills, Director of Development Services said staff was confident that these were things we could measure over time and report back to Council on how we are doing. Council member McGrath said he wanted more specific actionable language. Mr. Hills said the Utility Allocation Policy would be coming back to Council for specific decisions. He said the Land Use and Character Plan would have to be reviewed, to try to find areas proximate to employment centers, for housing. Council member McGrath said we just updated it. What did the consultant miss? Mr. Hills said they did not necessarily miss anything. But over time thoughts evolve and staff can look for areas to bring to Council. Council member McGrath said developers take 5-7 years before something comes to fruition. Saying that we may change it is going to send developers elsewhere. Mr. Hills said our goal would be to identify those areas, bring them to the Council, and allow changes to be made in the public hearing process. These plans do change over time as things change. We can give that tool to the development community to give them feedback on where Council wants to see growth and where they don't want to see growth. Staff is comfortable with that if Council wants to move forward.

MPT Berry said he could support initiatives 5.1 and 5.4. As for 5.3, he doesn't want to give bonuses for affordable housing on the utility allocation policy. He said it won't yield a result we want. He said he does not support 5.2 because he wants to evaluate each project on its own merits and not have a prescriptive menu.

Council member Wolff said he thinks the wording is great. Council had consensus on all four at the Retreat and staff did a great job of fleshing that out. MPT Berry said he wasn't going to vote for this. Council member Hewetson said she doesn't have a problem with it being included as an option for development agreements. It doesn't mean that it is required of them. If it's not limiting, they can talk about other things outside of this. She said she's OK with the four initiatives as they are written.

Mayor Mayefskie asked Council member Forrest how he felt and Council member Forrest asked Council member McGrath for his opinion. Council member McGrath said he's still struggling with this. He used a recent example to get certain options and incentives. Unless requirements are tied to the zoning process, once it's rezoned our hands are tied. Council member Wolff said that nothing about this menu changes by-right zoning. Nothing here is prescriptive. It will be a menu of options for a developer to offer into a developer agreement for Council to approve. We can still say "no" if we want to. It doesn't change the rezoning process, it just makes the staff negotiations on developer agreements a little bit easier. Mr. Hills said the zoning is still a legislative decision. State statues have changed and limited the ability of a Council to do that, which is not something we can control. Regarding how we would do this, is, *if* they were offering affordable housing, we could work with them through this menu. We heard that working with our partners is important to Council. If there is concern we could narrow it down to the partnership side of the house as opposed to development agreements. We tried to take what we heard at the Retreat and put it into an actionable initiative. Council member Wolff said we have had success with private and nonprofit with agreements. We don't need to limit ourselves. Mr. Hills said the purpose of this is, when there is an affordable housing component, there is a list that staff can bring back to Council to see if we want to offer these things in future development agreements. MPT Berry said he is still opposed.

Council member Forrest said we have a utility allocation policy coming soon that has Tier 1 and Tier 2 based on priorities of the Town. Now we have menu of options of what Council wants on top of that. Will we feed that into the UO to determine who gets Tier 1 and Tier 2? Mr. Hills said this is meant to work this way: If someone brings a project with an affordable housing component, we can show them options that Council might want to consider, and bring it to Council for a decision. MPT Berry said he thinks as an incentive within the Utility Allocation Policy may or may not get us what we want because they can say they are meeting the intent of the UDO and it won't move the needle. Council member Forrest asked where in the process the Utility Allocation Policy went into effect. Mr. Hills said they would have to know at the point of rezoning, before a development agreement is finalized. He suggested some additional clarity

from staff to Council could help. Council member Wolff asked why his colleagues had a problem with this. Council member McGrath said that developers would assume that these things would be approved and would be unhappy if Council said no. Mr. Hills said that these initiatives are not the same, they are complementary. The intent is to prevent someone using affordable housing to move to Tier 1, and then asking for credits on the back end. He said the wording was important and staff could work on this and bring it back to Council. Council member Forrest asked if there was a law on the books that we can't demand a developer do one thing. John Schifano, Town Attorney, said he was referring to Inclusionary Zoning. He said you can't dictate it. You can give them something they wouldn't otherwise be entitled to, and that's where the developer agreement comes in. We cannot guarantee people an unlimited supply of water. We will be pushed on the legality of this, but it's a finite resource and everyone across the country is doing this. The more clear language you can put, the better off we will be. It is fairly clear to talk about what is affordable and what's not, but that's the challenge. Council member McGrath asked if some of these could be linked together. Council member Wolff said that there are other things in the Utility Allocation Policy other than affordable housing. Developers don't have to offer affordable housing; there are other ways that they can get the points to move up. He said he trusts staff to keep them from double-dipping. Council discussed the legalities of a policy and how the draft policy is not a checklist and we would need to go forward with a developer agreement. Council member Wolff said there are two different ways to incentivize developers, so he doesn't see the down side of this. Council member Forrest said that if they are going to choose Affordable Housing and not have a developer agreement, they wouldn't do a traffic analysis. Council member Wolff said we would still have a developer agreement, we just wouldn't need to include affordable housing on it. That's not what 5.2 is saying. It's not a drop-down menu that we rubber stamp. It is just making the process smoother for staff. Council member Forrest said he wanted initiatives 5.2 and 5.3 to be rewritten. Councilmember McGrath said that for all projects we want to look at if they are they helping the Town meet some needs. If these are "preferred options" and we say no, we become the "not good partner." We have precedent for things that can go wrong. We won't get everything out of the project that we want. It would tie up the utility allocation. Mayor Mayefskie said he was hearing that one liked it as is; two don't like it; and two want some modifications. Council member Hewetson said she misunderstood initiative 5.2. She's good with the other three, but has questions on 5.2. Mr. Harrington said from a process point, he thinks there might be a majority on 5.1 and 5.4; but there might be some revisions needed on 5.2 and 5.3. If there's not a majority on that vote, he suggest they go down the list.
Mayor Mayefskie polled the Council with the following result:
Initiative 5.1 – majority agreed to keep it as is
Initiative 5.2 – staff to create some kind of menu of options to clarify, and bring it back to Council
Initiative 5.3 – move this out of Goal 5, but keep it in the Strategic Plan somewhere else
Initiative 5.4 – all agreed to keep it as-is.

Council member McGrath asked for detailed information/slides be provided ahead of the meeting for items such as this.

Mr. Petersohn said that next steps would be to bring revisions back to Council, before Council adopted the Strategic Plan at their April meeting, and adopt the budget at their June meeting.

3. EV Station at Ting Park

Greg Sponseller, Sustainability Coordinator, said he would provide an overview of the Duke Energy Park and Plug program, addressing EVSE (Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment) safety concerns, and provide an update on the Town's SolSmart progress. He said that Duke Energy would install and manage charging stations at Town facilities on a 5-year agreement where the Town would serve as site host for public charging stations. It is an opportunity to get level 2 Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations installed at almost no cost to the Town. He showed the state-wide distribution of EV ownership which showed them concentrated in the urban centers, including Wake County.

Mr. Sponseller addressed the safety concerns raised by Council of electric shock, vandalism, clustering of charging stations, and the proposed site selection at Town facilities. He outlined the equipment and installation processes including before, during and after installation safety features and inspections. He said the chargers are Underwriters Laboratories Certified and designed to be resistant to heat, cold, light, water, rust, wind, and tampering. They are designed to be used in the rain, and they have an earth ground connection which disables the station if there is an electrical fault. He said that the charging stations are networked and managed by software that monitors systems and communicates faults with alarms. They also communicate with a plugged-in vehicle to detect how much current can be accepted, and shut down automatically if a defect is detected. The Federal Energy Management Program provides best practices for hardware and software to prevent cybersecurity threats on networked charging stations.

Mr. Sponseller said that the greatest actual concerns were tripping or “clothesline hazards.” He said that more than 130,000 Level 2 and DC Fast Charging ports are safely used in the US every day. He explained that the current used in Level 2 charges is 240 volts, the same as used by electric dryers and stovetops. He said that one level 2 dual-port charger is proposed for Womble Park and up to four level 2 dual-port stations at Ting Park. The Duke program operates on a first-come, first-served basis, and the number of charges available to us has decreased to two at Ting.

Mr. Sponseller outlined the criteria and locations considered for the program. The Hunt Center was considered, but was not viable. He outlined the areas considered at Ting, and why the chosen area was proposed due to the location of an existing transformer 160 feet from where the new meter panel would need to be and other considerations. He showed what the stations would look like and how the spaces would be striped. He showed the same for Womble Park.

Mr. Sponseller said that to comply with the Duke Energy program requirements some Ordinances would need to be amended to allow parking 24 hours / 7 days a week in the EV spaces while actively charging a vehicle and some language around private for-profit activities would need to be clarified. He said these changes would come to Council at their next business meeting. He said that if Council approved of the proposed partnership with the Duke Energy Park and Plug program, he would request that they authorize the Town Manager to sign and execute contracts with Duke Energy for the Park and Plug program to install and operate electric vehicle charging stations at Ting and Womble Parks. Then, the Ordinance amendments would come to them at the March 21st business meeting for action.

Council member McGrath said he had a concern with the Womble location as kids get dropped off there and run down the sidewalk, and he is worried about them tripping. Mr. Sponseller said that at Womble they were limited to those spaces, due to the slope requirements and other criteria. Mr. Petersohn said that the ADA requirement was the most restrictive criteria and that cables would not be on the sidewalk. Council member McGrath said kids go through the least restrictive path and they wouldn’t stick to the sidewalk. MPT Berry said it was worth having this discussion. But at the end of the day, it’s Duke’s money and they don’t want to run a longer cable. He doesn’t want to give up the free installation. Council member Wolff asked how many ports we would get. Mr. Sponseller said 6 total ports – three chargers. He said that Duke was anxious to move forward. Consensus was to give the Town Manager authority to sign the agreement with Duke.

Next, Mr. Sponseller gave an update on the SolSmart program. The Town currently has SolSmart Silver designation, which we received in September 2022. Council had asked at the Retreat what it would take to get to Gold. He said some prerequisites for achieving the Gold designation would be a 3-day turnaround for solar projects, and codifying in the zoning ordinance that solar photovoltaic (PV) is allowed by-right in all major zones. The Town has already met this zoning requirement, and currently has 120 points out of 200 needed for the Gold designation. He listed some of the ways to achieve those credits, one of which was to join Solarize the Triangle '23 which would provide 20 points. The local lead for the project is TJ COG, with Apex, Cary, Morrisville, Raleigh, Chapel Hill, Carrboro, Hillsborough, Orange, Durham, and Chatham Counties partnering. Participation cost would be $2,000 and would offer discount pricing on PV equipment and installation to businesses and residents through bulk purchasing and group buying. This program would make solar PV more accessible to the community, and provide discounted rates. It is a limited time campaign which includes education and outreach, assistance with marketing materials, vetted contactors and materials, free evaluations, and a streamlined process. He asked Council if staff should pursue SolSmart Gold and, if so, whether they should consider adding a strategic initiative to that effect, and whether the Town should join Solarize the Triangle '23.

Council member McGrath said he didn't want to meet the 3-day permit turn around unless that was applied to all projects. Council member Wolff asked if the work load was the same for solar projects as other projects. Chris Hills, Director of Development Services said projects are all different. He said it would probably mean that solar projects "jumped the queue." Staff could do it, but there are times when it would be difficult. Mayor Mayefskie asked how many permit requests for solar the Town gets. Mr. Hills said we are getting more and more, probably 10-15 per month. Mr. Harrington said it would not be the whole project that got approved in 3 days; it was just the solar component. Mr. Sponseller said staff could look into how restrictive this requirement would be. Mr. Hills said the other things staff could do easily, but they would have to work on the permitting issue. Council member Wolff asked if we had reached out to the surrounding communities that are SolSmart Gold to ask how their experience with the 3-day permitting was. Council member McGrath said he wanted to ask also if there was dedicated staff in these other communities. Council member Wolff said the credit opportunities seemed like low-hanging fruit. Mayor Mayefskie asked if the program was based on a calendar year or fiscal year. Mr. Harrington said SolSmart Gold was not time-bound; it could take multiple years to get there. If Council would like more information on the 3-day permitting we could bring that back.

Council member Wolff asked for more information from neighboring municipalities. Council member Forrest said it wasn't bad for the Fire Department to know how to deal with solar. He said he had good thoughts about the credit opportunities. We are doing many of them. He thinks we should move forward with it. Mr. Sponseller said the only time-sensitive thing was the Solarize the Triangle program. That needed to be decided within the month. Council member Forrest said there are significant savings to be had in going solar, so it is good for our homeowners and businesses. If there is a way to do it he is for it. Council member Wolff said having the Town join the Solarize program is a huge incentive for residents, so he is in favor of that. Mayor Mayefskie asked for consensus and the consensus was to join Solarize the Triangle 23.

4. Williams Street Intersection

Chris Hills, Director of Development Services, said that he wanted to give Council an update on the NC 55 / Williams Street Intersection Project. He said the project was funded by NC 540 Bonus Allocation Funds, but that escalations have doubled construction estimates and, without value engineering, the project will be delayed indefinitely. The proposed changes reduce the costs by over 50% and result in safety and traffic improvements to the area now. And completing the project now means it will not compete with other Holly Springs projects in SPOT funding requests. He explained how the project had changed from the proposal in April 2021 to the current design. He showed how this alternative provided similar service in terms of minimizing delays as the preferred option, but at less cost. He said that the Town submitted a Letter of Opposition that was presented at the project open house with the Town's main concerns. He said that Apex also presented a Letter of Comment with their concerns but overall support for the project. The Town staff held a meeting with CAMPO to address those concerns. The Public Comment Period for the project ended March 2nd and NCDOT will compile public comments into their final report and design. Staff is seeking concurrence to support the project, while noting their preference for the interchange design.

Council member McGrath asked questions about which intersections were signalized. Mr. Hills showed where the signals were. Council member McGrath said that the intersection at Sunset Lake and Main is not signalized, and our residents use that section and the stacking is backed up beyond the capacity. It is that area, that is not being touched at all, that causes the most problems. Mayor Mayefskie asked what the timeline for the project was. Mr. Hills said they are in design, so probably 5 or 6 years. Mayor Mayefskie suggested that the next entrance to 540 would alleviate some of that congestion. Mr. Hills said CAMPO was very apologetic for not including Holly Springs. He said staff can go back and highlight some of those things that Holly Springs would value and see if we can get some of those things added. Mayor Mayefskie asked whether the new Wake Tech was considered in this design. Mr. Hills said they don't anticipate any changes due to Wake Tech; they are doing the best engineering they can do for the price. Mr. Harrington asked Mr. Hills to comment on Old Smithfield Rd and Williams St. and whether development interest was increasing in that area. Mr. Hills said the realignment of Old Smithfield Rd. is being contemplated as development comes. Mr. Hills said that even though the project being discussed now doesn't impact Holly Springs, the fact that it gets done now helps us compete for funds later. We are working through the realignment of Old Smithfield Rd. and that will help with the issue Council member McGrath raised. It helps traffic in the current situation, and also allows our projects to compete better in the future. He asked for Council's concurrence with the staff opinion and received it.

5. Upcoming Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Amendments

Chris Hills, Director of Development Services, said this item was to provide an overview of upcoming UDO text amendments which would come before Council at their next meeting. He said the new UDO is a year old now and during that time there have been 17 rezonings, 10 development plans, 2 major subdivisions, and 2 special use permits in some stage of the process. The UDO is a living document and staff typically prepares amendments twice a year. There are also proposed changes around Chapter 7: Streets, Utilities & Other Infrastructure, and Chapter 9: Signs. There are 51 amendments coming before Council. The majority of these are technical "clean up" type amendments, with three minor changes (building height in Innovation Village Mixed-Use District, fence height in Employment / Campus Use Districts, and foundation landscaping calculation) and one major change around the Utility Allocation Policy. He said amendments coming later in the spring or summer for Chapters 7 and 9 were around reorganization/consolidation, making sure terminology was consistent, and a minor content update around directional signs on a campus. There are no major policy changes proposed.

Council member Forrest asked when the changes would be seen. Mr. Hills said the 51 would be in the agenda packet for next meeting; the others will be later in the spring. Council member Wolff asked about a particular text change that was emailed about. Mr. Hills said there was a note from the draft document that accidently got left in the final document. This particular applicant wants to use that exemption so that it doesn't have to come before Council; we made them aware of why that was left in and are working with them on ways to allow them to complete their project without bringing on other projects that want to use that conflicting information, including a Developer agreement, delaying the effective date of the Ordinance amendment or other ways. Council member Wolff expressed a preference for a developer agreement rather than delaying the effective date of that section of the Ordinance. Council member McGrath expressed concern about extra traffic.

6. Legal and Clerk Quarterly Updates

a. Town Attorney

John Schifano, Town Attorney, said he emailed two things to Council, a legal memo about our gun ordinance in consideration of a new Supreme Court case. We are not in danger of offending the US Constitution, but there is one minor tweak he would like to bring back regarding penalty section to make it consistent with the rest of the ordinance. The second was a list of pending litigation matters and he asked if there were any questions, they could be addressed. Council wanted to discuss the ordinance at a workshop.

b. Town Clerk

Linda McKinney, Town Clerk, said that due to difficulties in finding a location for the 2023 Mayor and Council Retreat, she had started looking for the 2024 location and suggested that Council make a decision now and lock in a location. The difficulty is caused by multiple factors, including other groups booking 2 to 3 years in advance, policy changes at some of the venues Council used in the past that excluded our type of use, and the growing size of the Council's retreat. Choosing a location now and getting it reserved will preserve Council's preferred dates and location. She presented three options that are currently available for February 8 – 10, 2024. The Inn at River Landing in Wallace, Graylyn in Winston-Salem, and the Rizzo Center in Chapel Hill. She outlined the advantages and disadvantages of each and asked Council for feedback.

Consensus was to stay with the 3-day format and to hold the 2024 Mayor and Council Retreat at the Graylyn.

7. Open Discussion

Council member McGrath said that Friday is St. Patrick's Day. Wear green. Randy Harrington, Town Manager, said that the Wake County staff has recommended to the Board of Commissioners that Holly Springs be granted $2.3 million for Cass Holt Park. The Commissioners will vote on this in April, and Council could call the commissioners and thank them for their consideration, if they liked.

8. Closed Session: none.

9. Adjournment: There being no further business for the evening, motion to adjourn was made by MPT Berry second by Council member Forrest and passed with a unanimous vote. The March 13, 2023 meeting of the Holly Springs Town Council was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted on Tuesday, April 18, 2023.

Linda C. McKinney

Linda McKinney Town Clerk